

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-0672/158461.01  
**Application No.:** 09/995,224  
**Office Action Dated:** May 5, 2005

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 are pending in the present application, with claims 1, 12 and 21 being the independent claims. Claims 1 and 21 have been amended herein to address the subject matter rejection under 35 USC § 101, i.e., to recite that the helper object and recognizer are embodied in computer readable media. No new matter was added.

In the Official Action, dated May 5, 2005, claims 1-9 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 101. Claims 1-4, 7, 10-12, 15-20 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over US Publication No. 2002/0069223 A1 (Goodisman) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0123912 A1 (Subramanian). Claims 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Goodisman in view of Subramanian and further in view of US Publication No. 2003/0080986 (Baird). Claims 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Goodisman in view of Subramanian and further in view of US Patent No. 6,222,537 (Smith). Claims 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Goodisman in view of Subramanian and further in view of US Patent No. 6,122,647 (Horowitz). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Goodisman in view of Subramanian and further in view of US Publication No. 2002/0010769 A1 (Kippenhan). Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Goodisman in view of Subramanian, in view of Kippenhan and further in view of Smith.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The outstanding rejections to the claims based on the art of record are respectfully traversed. In view of the Declarations submitted herewith under 37 CFR § 1.131 by inventor

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0672/158461.01  
Application No.: 09/995,224  
Office Action Dated: May 5, 2005

PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116


Jerald L. Hittle, and test lead manager for the Smart Links project Richard Gerschwiler,  
Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of the present application was invented  
prior to the effective date of Subramanian and Goodisman, as defined in that Section.  
Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that Subramanian and Goodisman be removed as  
references applicable to the outstanding claims.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. §  
103(a) is thus earnestly requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points  
raised by the Examiner in the Office Action, and submit that Claims 1-23 of the application  
are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the  
application at the Examiner's earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

Date: July 1, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas E. Watson  
Registration No. 43,243

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439